

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 1-3, 6, 19-21 and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Boloker et al. This is a new ground of rejection. The office action alleges that the controller 363 shown in FIG. 28 of Boloker equates to the claimed controller and that a multi-modal shell equates to a multi-modal session proxy server as claimed. Applicant has amended claims to include inherent subject matter. For example, as to claim 1, the claimed controller is operative to select one or more of a plurality of multi-modal session proxy servers and the controller determines, on a per-session basis, which of a plurality of multi-modal proxy identifiers represent the proxy address of a selected multi-modal session proxy server of the plurality of proxy servers. Accordingly, the controller interfaces with a plurality of multi-modal session proxy servers and selects the multi-modal session proxy server on a per-session basis based on, for example, a multi-modal proxy identifier. As described in Boloker, the controller 363 is actually within or part of a multi-modal shell, also referred to as an interaction manager 357 and does not select among other multi-modal shells. The office action cites among other paragraphs, paragraph 232-235, 145 and 132 as allegedly teaching that the controller 363 determines, on a per-session basis, which of a plurality of multi-modal proxy identifiers represent a proxy address of a selected multi-modal session proxy server from a plurality of multi-modal proxy servers. No such teachings can be found in the cited portions of the Boloker reference. Instead, Boloker appears to teach a different structure in which each multi-modal shell utilizes its own controller 363. The controller 363 as described in

Boloker does not select from a plurality of multi-modal shells but to the contrary, controls a different component of the interaction manager 357 which is its own multi-modal shell. Since the reference does not teach what is alleged and does not teach the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 26 has been amended to add some limitations of claim 27. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 19, it is alleged that this claim incorporates substantially all of the limitations of claims 1 and 3 and is therefore rejected by the same reasoning. Applicant again respectfully submits that there is no teaching of Boloker of receiving a multi-modal proxy identifier on a per-session basis for a browser based on a selection from a plurality of multi-modal proxy servers. As noted above, there is no selection by a controller of which of a plurality of multi-modal proxy servers are selected on a per session basis. Accordingly, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 25, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 North LaSalle  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003  
312/609-7500  
312/609-5005 Facsimile